Online Dialogue Series:
All-Day, All-Year Schools

Edited Transcript

Participants

Ruy Teixeira
senior fellow,
The Century Foundation.

Richard Rothstein
is a Research Associate of the Economic Policy Institute, a columnist on education for The New York Times, and an Adjunct Professor of Public Policy at Occidental College in Los Angeles.

Jodi Wilgoren
national education correspondent,
New York Times.

Joy Dryfoos
independent researcher, writer, and lecturer, and author of
Full-Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth, and Families.

Part 1

Ruy Teixeira

I thought I would kick off the discussion by asking everyone to share their general reactions to the proposals contained in The Century Foundation's Idea Brief on All-Day, All-Year Schools. I suspect that you may like some of the ideas described better than others. For example, one common approach is to eliminate the traditional school calendar and replace it with a schedule that eliminates long summer vacations in favor of shorter breaks throughout the year. Schools remain open the same 180 days in total and school hours do not change. Other approaches are more ambitious and would make schools available to students for many more than the standard 180 days and would keep the schools open until most parents come home from work. What do you think about these different kinds of approaches?

Joy Dryfoos

In general, I think it is a good idea to extend the number of days that kids go to school BUT just extended the time will have little effect unless the quality of the system improves. Several issues overlap here.

Extending the amount of time that kids go to school. This can be done by increasing the number of hours in the school day or the number of days in the school year. These kinds of proposals are coming largely from the educational establishment with the goal of improving school achievement. Just adding hours and days will be meaningless unless quality is addressed. If children aren't doing well in a system, their performance probably won't improve much with more time on task if the teaching techniques are not changed.

Year round schooling. Keeping the school open all year with different schedules of vacations. This proposal is largely coming from the systems that are overcrowded and is an approach to using the building to crowd in more kids. Of course, if it results in smaller class sizes, this could be a benefit. But it also might result in considerable confusion and be difficult for families with children on different schedules.

Opening the school building all the time. Proposals to get the schoolhouse doors open long hours reflect concerns about the safety of children after school and the quest for childcare on the part of working parents. Advocates for full service community schools would like to see the schools used as a neighborhood hub and seamless service center for children and families. Many versions of this

approach are appearing on the scene. After-school programs are proliferating rapidly, usually organized jointly by school systems and community agency partners.

My vision of what an all-day all-year school would look like is a joint venture between the school system and other agencies to keep the school building open almost all of the time (before and after school, evenings, weekends, vacations, summers). The educational program for the child would extend beyond the classroom, integrated with enriching experiences that can be contributed by the community partners.

I don't believe that the school system should have the entire responsibility for keeping the building open.

Richard Rothstein:

The costs of these programs, if made universally available, are so enormous as to be inconceivable. So a more modest agenda is needed if the intent is to make a realistic contribution to public debates.

There are many purposes of these programs, but I will focus only on one here: to narrow the achievement gap between disadvantaged (poor and African American or Hispanic) and advantaged children.

The most important priority here is probably fully qualified teachers in the existing system.

The second most important priority is probably pre-kindergarten classes (preschool), taught by fully qualified teachers.

And the third most important priority is probably class size reduction in the primary grades.

After these come the all-day, all-year programs we are discussing, which provide a safe and more intellectually, culturally, and morally appropriate environment for school-age children in their non-school hours.

So my reaction to all this is, "let's get real"...the costs are inconceivable in the present political climate.

Children are presently in school for about 1,080 hours a year (180 days times 6 hours per day), under the supervision of fully certified professionals. The cost for this regular school program is probably about $4,500 per child (common discussions of per pupil cost include special education programs, which I do not include here), including administrative supervision and other overhead. This is about $2.50 per school hour per child. It is a low-end estimate, because it accepts current class sizes in the primary grades.

If before- and after-school programs are implemented for another six hours a day, the cost will not be less than another $4,500 per child. (In some cases, costs can be reduced because non-professional workers can be used instead of fully certified teachers, but not to the extent currently the case in poor-quality after-school programs; on the other hand, costs will be greater than regular school costs because pupil-adult ratios must be lower in high-quality after-school programs, where children are not sitting at desks in classrooms under a teacher's supervision. So in the absence of more careful costing-out, it is safe to assume similar costs.)

If full-day programs are implemented for days not currently covered by the regular school calendar, the costs escalate further. Using a $2.50 per hour per child estimate, if quality programs (supervised by adequately trained professionals where necessary) are to be included with appropriate child-adult ratios), and if the programs operate for 10 hours a day, 5 days a week, the costs are an additional $125 per week per child. If they operate for the full 12 weeks that schools are not generally in session (not including holidays), this is an additional $1,500 per child.

And these estimates do not include the costs of other services (health, social service, family support services) that should be included in the "full service schools" being discussed.

So, without even beginning to approach the "full service schools" concept, we are contemplating programs that more than double the costs of educating disadvantaged children.

Of course, with more children of all social classes lacking a parent at home, such programs are needed for working class and middle class children as well.

So my reaction to all this is, "let's get real." The costs of increasing teacher salaries to ensure qualified regular schoolteachers for disadvantaged children are substantial. The costs of providing universal preschool are substantial. The costs of reducing regular class size are substantial.

If, in addition to this, you propose all-day, all-year schools, the costs are inconceivable in the present political climate.

It seems to me that some consideration of priorities is in order here. Perhaps all-day, all-year schools are more important than the teacher-qualification, preschool and class size programs normally thought of as being high priorities. But without a discussion of priorities, in the present political climate, a lot of this discussion is fantasy.

There are, of course, existing all-day and all-year programs. But they are mostly funded by foundations or other private money, except for the Clinton Administration's pilot "21st Century" program. Private money works for limited demonstration programs, but not for a universal program.

And most of the privately funded programs are, because of funding limitations, of unacceptably poor quality, although they may be better than nothing. So another place to consider priorities is in program quality. In the interests of expanding these programs, for example, are we prepared to advocate utilizing paraprofessionals, paid $7 an hour, rather than trained professionals to supervise and guide children?

Jodi Wilgoren:

I don't think Richard is wrong about the enormous price tag, but I do think it may be useful -- and important -- to set that aside for at least a minute to think in broad, philosophical terms about what might make sense for a school system of the future.

When I was growing up, Tuesday and Thursday lunch was a plate of elbow macaroni swimming in melted margarine, grilled cheese sandwiches with tomato soup, or, my favorite treat, egg-cheese sandwiches, a sort of French toast with melted American slices in between, served with maple syrup. My elementary school let out at 1 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and we children went home for lunch. Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays were about soggy tuna or peanut butter on Wonder, but Tuesdays and Thursdays were hot lunches made by mom.

Of course, my mom now works until 6, as did the mothers of lots of my friends back then (they used to want to come to my house on Tuesdays and Thursdays). I imagine that if I were in elementary school today, Tuesdays and Thursdays would be about making my own peanut butter sandwiches, and the entire week would be a complicated nightmare of trying to figure out who was going to drive me where and when. Or, maybe, I'd end up home most afternoons, watching television instead of being shuttled around town for my myriads lessons and practices in piano, gymnastics, soccer, softball, ice skating, Hebrew, and ballet.

It seems abundantly clear that the school calendar is a remnant of an earlier time, and has nothing to do with the realities either of the modern family's schedule or our societal expectations of what children should learn.

I envision a completely different approach to the school day and year. Schools everywhere would run from about 8 to 6, with many buildings open in the evenings (and perhaps early mornings) for community events. The afternoons would be set aside for enrichment programs, and the schools -- or districts -- would set up elaborate shuttle systems and partnerships with community groups and entrepreneurs to provide various lessons and workshops, from art to sports to volunteerism and internships. The idea would be to mimic the idyllic afternoon schedules of middle class suburbanites with mom's taxi being replaced by yellow school buses. Families would get a menu of options at the beginning of the semester and decide which lessons they wanted for their children, Middle class and poor children would have similar options. There would be academic tracks -- tutoring for strugglers, advanced classes for the ambitious -- as well as the other options. As for the yearly calendar, the extended summer vacation would be cut in half, to 4 or 6 weeks, with 2-3 week vacations scattered throughout the rest of the year, leaving schools the option of whether to create several tracks or not to relieve crowding. There would be 200 days of instruction instead of 180.

...it's idiotic that we're attached to an agrarian schedule or, frankly, to a Levittown schedule reliant on stay-at-home moms. It only serves to exacerbate the opportunity gap between rich and poor.

Maybe this would cost twice as much as the current system. But in a time of unprecedented prosperity and unprecedented focus on education, maybe society would be willing to spend twice as much. What people are uninterested in doing is adding dollars -- whether George Bush's $10 billion or Al Gore's $115 billion -- to tweak programs around the edges. People are unenthusiastic about raising teacher salaries in any significant way as long as teachers' job descriptions are basically the same. I'm not saying we could do this tomorrow, but it seems to me the only way we could possibly consider a radical restructuring of the way education is financed, and the amount we as a society spend on each child's education, would be to radically restructure our entire concept of school. In this new system, middle class families would save a ton of money on babysitters and private enrichment programs, so part of it could be paid for with a tax increase on them.

A few specific advantages to this approach: --Making teaching a fulltime, year-round job would help professionalize it, as well as justify increased pay. (Richard Riley has said this a few times now). Teachers should be making in the 70s. Nobody is going to support doubling the salary until the structure of the job totally changes. This will also help attract a different cadre of people to the job. --More time in class means more learning, at least we hope. --Enrichment programs more fairly spread around, and seen as a public responsibility. --Better use of our public buildings. --Staggering vacations might relieve crowding at tourism destinations!

I know Richard and others can poke 8 million holes in this notion with specifics, and they're not wrong. Of course Richard and Joy are both right that high-quality teachers are probably more of a priority than any of this should be (certainly expanding the number of hours or days in an unproductive classroom is not a good idea). But it's idiotic that we're attached to an agrarian schedule or, frankly, to a Levittown schedule reliant on stay-at-home moms. It only serves to exacerbate the opportunity gap between rich and poor.

Practically all the successful new charter schools, mimicking private and prep schools, are doing this longer-day, longer-year thing, most with significant commitments to enrichment. Parents are flooding them with applications. It shouldn't come as a surprise.

Part 2

Ruy Teixeira:

I was very intrigued with Jodi's vision of a different approach to the school day and year. It sounds intuitively right to me that we need to think of this idea as a fundamental shift in the way our society does schools. Twenty years from now, people will probably look back on the era when schools were open only 6 hours a day and closed all summer and say "what were they thinking? how could they have lived that way?" I think Jodi's absolutely right that the current school calendar and the realities of modern family schedules and societal expectations just don't have a lot to do with each other; one of these has to give and inevitably it will be the traditional school calendar.

Now, if this is going to be a fundamental shift in the way we organize the public schools, I don't think we should be too deterred by the high price tag that will be attached to such a reorganization. It may be true that the price tag is too high to do this all at once in today's political climate--but then again that's rarely the way these things happen anyway. There will be a transition period, during which accumulating chunks of money will be allocated to this reorganization.

And I don't think we should discount the fact that the public mood is much more pro-spending than it used to be, particularly when it comes to education. Of course, it doesn't do much good for folks to be pro-spending, when there's no money to spend--but that's hardly the case today, with budget surpluses as far as the eye (or CBO, at any rate) can see. Indeed, once the current, somewhat dotty, obsession with debt reduction goes away--which I believe will happen (another likely "what were they thinking" case for future observers)--there will be even more money to spend.

Of course, Richard wasn't entirely arguing that that the all-day, all-year approach was intrinsically too expensive (at least I don't think so), but rather that, given the competing priorities of teacher quality (which would almost certainly involve higher teacher pay--see Idea Brief #14, "Expanding the Supply of Quality Teachers," just posted last week), universal preschool and smaller class size, the idea's costs

were prohibitive. Joy also was concerned that we don't want to just add length to the school year and day--pedagogical quality is critical. These are reasonable points, but I like Jodi's counter that people are unenthusiastic about just adding money to the system to tweak it about edges--they're looking for something that's going to make schooling better in a Big way. This could especially apply to paying teachers much higher salaries, if they're basically going to do what they did before (again, see Idea Brief #14 for more along these lines).

I also think it is questionable to view this idea as something for poor/disadvantaged students alone. In my view, it won't fly unless it's universal in character, embracing the poor and the middle class alike.

My mind teems with other comments, but perhaps these will be sufficient to stir the pot a bit more. In addition, here are a few specific questions we might want to consider in the process of the general debate.20

(1) Richard's right that cost is obviously a big factor here; would we be happy seeing paraprofessionals with much lower salaries being used for part of this restructuring? How much would these costs be held down by the fact that use of these programs would hardly be universal even at the lower grade levels and would presumably drop off substantially among older (e.g., middle and especially high school students?

(2) How important is the social service component of this, as laid out by Joy in her contribution? Would it be possible to add this component (creating "full service" community schools) through business and other partnerships?

(3) What about the issue of priorities? Do people agree with Richard's ranking of the three items above over the all-day, all-year approach?

(4) Whatever one's feelings about these priorities, what do we make of the extremely small allocation to these programs in the Presidential candidate's budgets--about $400 million in Gore's budget and, I think, zero in Bush's budget?

Wilgoren:

A few quicker thoughts...

Regarding the cost and the question of radical shifting in our conception of schools: I'm really thinking of a shifting in our conception of what percentage of the government's money (all governments) should be devoted to education. I don't know off the top how much we spend now (state, local and feds) nor do I know off the top how much money there are in all these governments put together. But who's to say education has to be X percent and defense has to be X percent and garbage pickup has to be X percent. I feel like if we asked people, hey, what do you want from your government, what do you want your taxes to be spent on, what would you be willing to pay MORE taxes to have, education would be up there, better schools would be up there and longer schools might even be up there. (There was a recent poll that I wrote a story about that basically said this, that education was the top national political priority, and that people would be willing to spend more on it).

As for teacher salaries, I see this as a path toward paying teachers more. It's a little counterintuitive, but I think the issue is not so much that teachers earn too little per hour, but that the low annual salary denotes a low professional status, which deters the best people from entering.

I'm glad Ruy brought up the question of para-professionals, because I meant to say something about this in my original post. One of the most interesting things that came up when I was researching the story about the proliferation of after-school programs was the way that these programs brought different types of people into schools, and into the lives of kids. At one school in the Bronx, a cafeteria lady worked in the after-school program, running a class that included art projects, circle games, some library research, and various other low-level education activities. Not only did this clearly provide her with a great way to expand her job, both in terms of earning capacity and in terms of skill development, but it also seemed to create neat relationships with the kids. This woman was black, as they were, whereas their teachers were mostly white. She was from their neighborhood and a similar class status. She was probably more like their parents than the people who normally teach them (in fact a lot of parents also volunteered in this program), and yet had a bit more education and a more solid job than most of the adults the kids came into contact with at home. So this after-school program provided a different kind of child-adult relationship, one I'm not sure they would get elsewhere (not

unlike the one that might happen in a Boy Scout troop or YMCA basketball team, but EVERY kid gets it here). I also heard a lot about programs in LA and elsewhere that worked hard to recruit unemployed adults from the local communities to staff the after-school programs. Again, this seems good for job opportunities, for building community ties, and for providing adult relationships that fall somewhere between parents and teachers.

On the community center front: This could potentially be a way for the schools to recoup some of the added cost, as other non-profits who want to share the space might pay some kind of rent...

As for the money: Clinton-Gore has massively expanded the amount for after school programs, from $1 million to $454 million, since 1997. That's not a huge amount, but it is a rapid-fire increase.

***Rothstein**:*

I emphasize again that it is necessary to set priorities. We now spend about $300 billion a year on elementary and secondary education. The back-of-the-envelope estimate I provided yesterday about the cost of an all-day-all-year program, if universal, and if it had minimum quality, would probably double that. If you add the cost of "full service" programs (family services, health, dental, etc.), it goes higher. The idea of getting "private" contributions to cover part of this falls apart in a universal program. Private contributions will not be available to supplement public money in small towns and suburbs around the country.

I don't think a program costing $300 billion a year is politically conceivable. While I agree that there is no time like the surplussed-present to consider big new ideas, this one is too big. And I don't trust public opinion polls where people say they would be willing to spend more money on education. Respondents to public opinion polls don't have to balance alternatives, like tax cuts, prescription drugs, deficit reduction, missile defense, etc. -- that's why we have representative government.

If you are thinking about what schools will look like 20 years from now, a plan to get there must be incremental. What do we do first?

I think a sensible answer has to include targeting -- it is poor children who need these the most. I grant all the arguments against this, and in favor of universal programs, but I can't conceive of the funds being available to make this universal.

I will raise one other issue regarding universality. To the extent these programs are universal (i.e., include middle class as well as poor children), program quality will inevitably be higher in middle class than in poor communities. This will result in an increase in the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children. This is not a reason not to implement such programs in middle class communities. I am merely commenting on one likely result of such implementation.

Research has shown that the growth of the achievement gap during children's school years occurs mostly during the summer -- disadvantaged and advantaged children actually gain about equally as much during the school year, but advantaged children continue to gain during the summer and disadvantaged children fall behind. So the biggest impact we could make in narrowing the gap is to have an intensive program available for poor children in the summers (and, I think, also probably in extended days). To have the intended effect, this must be a high quality program (i.e., including many trained teachers). It can't happen if this intention is diluted in efforts to implement a universal program all at once, with no thought given to priorities.

Having said all this, I certainly don't disagree with Jodi's or Ruy's notion of what an ideal world would look like.

Finally, it is an ongoing tragedy of American public policy that we give no attention to research or to experimental design. The 21st Century program by which the federal government is now funding "full service" schools (on a 50-50 match basis) in a small number of schools around the country has should have a substantial research component. It is regrettable that the selection of schools to receive these 3-year funds (out of the many that applied) was not done on a randomized basis, with a research component that tracks, over the long term, outcomes of children in schools that received the grants with those in schools that lost out in the lottery.

Research has fairly convincingly shown (at least to me) that the growth of the achievement gap during children's school years occurs mostly during the summer -- disadvantaged and advantaged kids actually gain about equally as much during the school year, but advantaged kids continue to gain during the summer and disadvantaged kids fall behind.

***Dryfoos*:**

I have definitely fallen in with a fast-thinking crowd here...and so many stimulating and controversial points have been raised, it's hard to know where to jump in.

The question of schools being open longer hours is a "done deal". It is no longer "whether"; it is what will they look like and who will operate them—which is why this discussion may be useful.

The money question is certainly valid...but I think we should hold that one until we can formulate a vision of what schools will look like in the future. No matter what we come up with, it will cost. What always gets lost in these debates is how little the federal government puts into education...and as has been said, at this point it is not because no funds are available.

I agree with Richard...funds must be targeted to the neediest kids. The "summer loss" phenomenon is a significant argument for supporting summer programs of some kind...although it doesn't necessarily mean just doing what ever goes on during the winter. I do not agree with Ruy that these ideas won't fly unless they are universal. The middle class doesn't need much help to take advantage of new ideas like charter schools or extended hours. Parents all over the country are clamoring for after-school programs. Polls show very high support for these ideas, even to spending money for them. This country is still unable to cope with the race/class differences that shape our public school systems and dump all the needy into inner city schools that have to be rescued if the nation is to flourish in the future.

I believe that school buildings should be open all the time because they are often the only hub in the community where the neighborhood can get together. However, I do not believe that the educational system should be solely responsible for creating these hubs. The schools of the future should be organized through partnerships between school systems and community agencies, with governance that is more inclusive than now. The community agencies can bring their own resources into the schools giving the new entity that evolves the opportunity to decide what is needed in that location. The key to all this is flexibility—involving parents, school people, community people, and even kids...in designing new institutions that make sense in that site. (Missouri's Caring Communities has established over 100 Caring Community schools organized by 18 Community Partnerships).

To answer Ruy's question about how important is the social service component in full service schools, it all depends on what's needed. And whatever that is can usually be found through businesses and partnerships. Communities in Schools have been supporting the relocation of social workers and case managers in schools for some time. (One school after polling the parents on needs put in laundry facilities and was pleased to report a huge increase in parent involvement.)

The Children's Aid Society schools in New York City's Washington Heights (a model being adapted in about 70 sites around the country) exemplifies this structure. The school is open extended hours including the summer. A CAS coordinator is on site as a peer to the principal. Other agencies are involved in arts, youth development programs, a primary health clinic, lots of mental health, family resource center, etc. etc. What the CAS and other agencies contribute is integrated with what goes on in the classroom. Thus the students from the Expressive Arts Academy at the middle school get involved in dance and art projects after-school that extend their learning. The kids are not aware of which part of their day is run by the school system and which part by CAS.

Research on community schools is encouraging (I have a paper on the subject at www.communityschools.org). The CAS schools in NY have shown improvements in academic achievement, parent involvement, and community safety.

The theory is that the school people must be free to concentrate on quality education. Many of the barriers to learning have to be addressed by other agencies who are equipped and financed to do those jobs.

The schools of the future should be organized through partnerships between school systems and community agencies, with governance that is more inclusive than now. The community agencies can bring their own resources into the schools giving the new entity that evolves the opportunity to decide what is needed in that location.

In my view, priority has to be distributed simultaneously to teacher training (and supervision), smaller class sizes, and teachers' salaries—AND to bringing to bear all the supports necessary to eliminate the barriers that create the achievement gap. You've got to do both at the same time.

The estimate that I used on costs for this in Safe Passage was $250,000 per school per year for the 22,000 schools with very disadvantaged kids, which comes to about $5.5 billion a year—enough to create the infrastructure for operating a full service community school (e.g. coordinator, administration, accountability). This would not at all cover the cost of the quality education part. It would support a team with the capability of attracting other resources to the school and using them in an integrated non-fragmented way. One example might be DARE...public funds now being spent on a drug prevention program that doesn't work—there are move successful models that train police officers to work with kids on positive youth development as part of the team that works in the full service school.

Richard, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) does not really fund full service schools although the grantees (only Local Educational Agencies LEAs) have some leeway on what they can provide in addition to school remediation. The Mott foundation and the DOE are putting a lot of effort into evaluation...a major random assignment evaluation is underway right now and several other privately funded efforts with the Soros After School Program in New York and others. Mott has created a network of after-school program evaluators.

The big tension with the CCLCs is the desire by community agencies to get into the act. Although the LEAs are required to give evidence that they collaborate with youth agencies, still the money goes directly to them. The National Collaboration for Youth protested and asked that 20% go directly to youth agencies. That didn't happen...but the issue won't go away. The president's budget calls for $1 billion for after school and it looks like they will get $600 million at least. A new field of after-school work is evolving...and as Jodi pointed out, many use non-certified personnel with lower salaries. LA Best one of the most comprehensive after school programs is entirely run by community-based people.

Part 3

Teixeira:

Obviously, Richard is right that the cost/priorities issue is a big one when thinking about how we can get from where we are--which is just the beginnings on an all-day, all-year system--to our vision of where we'd like to be. But that still doesn't mean, in my view, that the exercise of envisioning where we would like to go is a useless one and we must confine ourselves to discussing only the first and most feasible step of our journey to a better school system.

That said, let me suggest some ways in which the cost issue is not quite so serious as Richard argues. First, the uptake rate for these programs will be way lower than 100 percent, particularly among older students and particularly in affluent areas. This will commensurately reduce costs. Second, as Jodi's posting illustrated, there are surely many ways in which para-professionals can be used in various after school enrichment activities that would further reduce costs. Third, there are a number of these programs that require some modest parental co-pay; such co-pays could further reduce costs to the government, even if means-tested as they probably should be. Fourth, as Jodi was remarking, these programs would save huge amounts for parents in childcare payments, so the net costs on a society-wide basis should be much less than the costs to the government. Finally, overhead costs for keeping schools open longer should, at the margin, be less than average current overhead costs.

Hey, but that's not to deny we're talking about the big bucks here and we therefore need a strong motivation to engage in such large expenditures. That's where the vision comes in of matching school systems up with the realities of current family and economic life. And I think Joy makes a very important point: the move toward keeping schools open longer is already happening--regardless of what we think about priorities--because the logic of doing so is so compelling. As she puts it, it's a "done deal" and the real argument will be over how and by whom. My sense is that she's right about this.

I think once middle-class parents get wind of this thing, they're all going to want it and we would be foolish to undercut potential popular support for this measure by pitching it as a program for poor people.

Of course, this is a pretty massive and expensive transformation we're talking about and we will take awhile to get there. The financial resources involved, whatever their magnitude, will not be allocated all at once. Given that, what of the argument to target resources pretty much exclusively to low-income students?

I still don't like this idea; I think once middle-class parents get wind of this thing, they're all going to want it and we would be foolish to undercut potential popular support for this measure by pitching it as a program for poor people. That doesn't mean, however, that we can't structure our policy approach so that low-income schools get more resources, get them fastest, and are in some ways subsidized (see comment on co-pays above). But, I do think it would be a big mistake to start out with the intention to bring this approach to poor communities and ignore middle class ones.

A related complaint of Richard's is what about quality teachers, universal preschool, etc.---are these chopped liver or what? Won't focusing on all-day, all-year preclude moves in these directions? I don't think so. In fact, I buy Jodi's line that a move in the all-day, all-year direction would actually facilitate a move toward treating teachers like real professionals and paying them decently, which would do a lot to deal with the teacher quality problem (see Idea Brief #14). As for universal pre-school, that's definitely already happening (note that where it's moving forward, it's on a universal basis) and could really be included as part of our proposed system of keeping schools open for more hours for more purposes.

I suppose that's really the theme here. We need to project a vision of what a new and better system of schooling for the 21st century will look like and the all-day, all-year approach is, in my view, an integral part of that. Fiscal and political realities will definitely put some parts of this vision on faster and slower tracks--that's difficult to argue with. But we should keep our eyes on the prize--what parents are likely to want and need in the future from the school system.

Finally, a couple of more things to throw in the hopper.

(1) My sense is we're thinking about these extra school hours as being optional. In Jodi's very interesting article today in the Times today, she wrote about some innovative high-poverty schools where they have long (mandatory) school hours. Would it be the case in such a system as we are envisioning that some schools would want/need to set mandatory long and/or summer hours?

(2) Nobody seems to be saying anything about the approach of simply altering the traditional school calendar to eliminate the long summer break, but otherwise leaving school hours the same? Would I be mistaken in concluding that no one thinks much of that particular approach?

***Rothstein*:**

Here is a well-known example about what happens when policymakers fail to consider priorities, or when they let the politics of universality trump judgments about where needs are greatest.

Several years ago, California, which had the largest class sizes in the nation (35 was not unusual, 30 common), decided to use its budget surplus to reduce class sizes to 20 in grades K-3. All schools, regardless of student SES, were eligible for CSR (class size reduction) funds. At the time, California was already suffering from a shortage of qualified teachers.

And, on the issue of paraprofessionals, what business do we have hiring workers to take care of our children for only $7 an hour?...if we create a new corps of workers paid $7 an hour, the children of these workers will exhibit the same kinds of poverty-related educational deficits that the workers are being hired to remedy.

Here is what happened: with a new demand for teachers in all districts and schools, the suburban middle class schools and districts were able to bid away many of the most qualified teachers from inner city schools. CSR resulted in a redistribution of teachers, so that the polarization of more qualified teachers in middle class schools, with emergency-credential under-qualified teachers in inner-city schools, was exacerbated. As a result of CSR, many poor and minority children in California today have less qualified teachers than they had prior to the program. You might argue that poor children are better off in a class of 20 with an unqualified teacher than they were in a class of 30 with a qualified one, but it is not an obvious argument to make. (Of course, if education in poor schools is conceived of only as being drill from scripted programs then perhaps qualified teachers are not needed, but that's a different story).

The same kind of redistribution can be expected if all-day all year schools ("ADAY schools") are approached with universality being a requirement. There is a national shortage of teachers today, and the shortage is most extreme in the states where ADAY schools are most needed. (There is a surplus of qualified teachers in the upper Midwest-- Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa; national policy should be focused on getting the overproduced young teachers from the state universities in these places to move to places like Texas, California, Florida, etc., but this national policy will be defeated if ADAY suddenly creates vast new numbers of teaching positions in the upper Midwest.)

So, my conclusion is not only that it is imprudent to attempt this as a universal program; it could be irresponsible because it will have forseeable negative consequences. In saying this, I don't for a moment deny the political attraction of having a universal program, nor do I deny the real needs of middle class working families to have more extended support from schools than these families presently receive. But we have many social crises in this nation, and some are more critical than others.

What about the use of paraprofessionals instead of teachers? Again, in a universal program, middle class communities will have less difficulty finding qualified professionals than inner city communities. The paraprofessionals will disproportionately end up in the less-advantaged communities. And, again, I don't deny that some of these paraprofessionals will do wonderfully (for example, the cafeteria-worker example that was used in this discussion the other day). But we have plenty of research to show that paraprofessionals are no substitutes for qualified teachers -- this is one of the reasons that Title I has been so relatively ineffective.

And, on the issue of paraprofessionals, what business do we have hiring workers to take care of our children for only $7 an hour? This is not the place for an extended discussion of income distribution and inequality, but if we create a new corps of workers paid $7 an hour, the children of these workers will exhibit the same kinds of poverty-related educational deficits that the workers are being hired to remediate.

There was some suggestion in these discussions that extending the time teachers spend in contact with children will help to elevate the status of the profession and attract more qualified graduates to the profession and create political support for raising teacher salaries. Secretary Riley was cited in support of this notion. I differ.

Contrary to popular belief, teachers are already nearly full-time workers, or should be, if their non-contact hours were properly organized and supervised. American teachers already spend more contact hours with children than teachers in other industrialized nations like Japan. They make up for this by having less preparation time, less time for collaboration, professional development, etc. Certainly, it will not professionalize the teaching profession to extend daily contact hours beyond 6. There may be a few more days in the summer that can be added to a teacher's contact-days, but not many. (There are approximately 250 work days in a year [52 X 5, less 10 national holidays]; teachers already work about 200 of them, not including preparation time; if teachers were paid as year round professionals, and received 25 days of vacation per year, this gives the flexibility to extend work days for another 25 days, but at least some of these should be devoted to additional preparation, professional development, etc.)

As much as I adored summer camp, and as much as it was a huge part of my development, who needs 8 weeks of it? We shouldn't just assume that what was good in our childhoods should be repeated for the next generation. I say we slash and burn summer, and make school a basically year round proposition.

So, in short, I don't see any way around the need to hire many more qualified professionals if ADAY is to be implemented. The less targeted the initial implementation, the more expensive this will be, and the more perverse consequences (specifically, the redistribution of teachers from high-need to lower-need communities) there will be. I don't discount the lesser cost that will result from the less-than-universal "uptake" rate, but this needs to be offset by the greater adult-pupil ratios required in a quality program (one teacher cannot escort 25 children to an art museum, or teach music to 25 children at once, or engage in any of the types of enrichment activities that middle class children get in their non-regular school hours). The overhead savings are not obvious, unless you consider capital costs, which were not included in my original back-of-the envelope estimates. Once you take out special education program costs, there is no reason to believe that the direct costs of ADAY would be any less than the direct costs of traditional schooling. Nobody has added up the pluses and minuses here, but even if the costs are 1/3 of my initial estimate, this is more costly than we can presently contemplate.

There was a suggestion in a previous posting that preschool is now being implemented on a universal basis. This is not the case. The most important programs are targeted to poor children. Texas, which has the biggest public pre-kindergarten program, funds only districts with poor children (although middle class children in the same districts are often also offered the program). The New Jersey Abbott decision requires preschool in the high poverty districts only, and that is how New Jersey is funding it. To the extent preschool is being offered around the nation in middle class communities, it is exacerbating the teacher shortage which, as noted, adversely affects poor communities the most. I am not suggesting that middle class communities should not offer these programs, only that there are perverse consequences of their doing so.

And here is another issue: should the federal government, as opposed to states, be responsible for this expansion of the educational system? As I argue in a chapter of a forthcoming Century Foundation book, there are some states that cannot afford to undertake this expansion, but there are others that can afford to do so, and should. If ADAY were implemented on a matching basis (like the 21st Century CLC program, although for states that can afford to fund ADAY, a 50% federal contribution may be too high, after the demonstration phase has been completed), state money would have to be involved.

Wilgoren:

Sorry I was out of the loop yesterday. I was actually at the first day of a new charter school in the Bronx that runs from 7:30 a.m. (breakfast) until 5 p.m. (5:30 p.m. if you're in the orchestra). Which gave me some interesting thoughts -- or at least questions -- about the all day school phenomenon.

There were kids crying about missing home and their mamas (5th graders, not kindergarteners). And by the end of the day, the kids were exhausted (so was I, and their teachers). As any teacher knows, there is a huge difference in behavior and attitude and attention span between morning and afternoon hours. This is just exacerbated in a long-hours schedule. On the other hand, it enables the school to run 90-minute blocks for reading and math, which everyone says is the greatest.

The day also raises more philosophical questions regarding the issue of targeting, which we've been discussing in terms of hours, but is also relevant on any number of topics. One of the things I am struck by in watching this new school, which has rigid discipline, rituals, etc, is how different it is from the lovely middle class suburban school of my youth. And how nobody in my community would have any interest in this kind of a place (which is not unlike the Kipp Academy). In all of our education discussions about how to help the poor, minority kids close the achievement gap with their white middle-class peers, I wonder whether it's fair that no one seems to actually be trying to mimic the educational experience of those white middle-class peers. Or maybe there really is a different need?

I agree with Ruy, in theory, that universality is important to our political approach to these questions of scheduling, though I also agree with Richard that, pragmatically, it makes sense to target resources where the need is. I think middle-class families could be expected to pay for some of these things on a fee basis; there are a gazillion examples in our system of activities and programs that are fee-based but given free to people who can't afford them. The extended-day enrichment program could be like that.

It's not that I'm so worried about the middle class wanting all this great stuff the poor get; more that I'm really thinking of it in terms of a reconception of what school is, and that that psychological shift needs to happen in the middle class as well (frankly, needs to be led by the middle class).

In terms of Richard's smart comments about the problem of less qualified teachers in poor neighborhoods...It seems to me that there needs to be a policy shift in terms of teacher pay, to provide higher salaries and other benefits to teachers in those neighborhoods. The better working environment -- both in terms of physical conditions and in terms of the educational ease, relatively -- in the suburbs will continue to attract many good teachers there. But there seems to be some number of young, idealistic types who really only want to teach in inner cities. Could that cadre be expanded if there were financial incentives (or fewer financial disincentives)? I think maybe. So then the question is how much we want to interfere with economics. Now, middle class communities have more tax revenue and thus can spend more. There's some movement in the courts to attempt to equalize this, of course, but why not as a matter of policy make it unequal--tilted the other way?

On some specific points that have come up:

- *Summer break.* Overrated and outdated. I totally agree with Richard that the most concerning part of the achievement gap seems to be summer learning loss. So I think a huge priority should be to continue the already huge growth in summer school, especially for the poor, but I think we need to work on an attitudinal shift to match. The notion of summer school as remedial and mandatory for failing kids doesn't cut it. It's stopgap, it's punitive, it's test score focused. It does not seem to have as its goal the creation of a truly middle-class educational environment for those kids. As much as I adored summer camp, and as much as it was a huge part of my development, who needs 8 weeks of it? We shouldn't just assume that what was good in our childhoods should be repeated for the next generation. I say we slash and burn summer, and make school a basically year round proposition. There should be a mix of academics and of enrichment throughout the year. I see no reason why there should be a season off from academic learning. If there were four to six weeks off in summertime there could still be some short-term camps. This would, of course, save all those middle-class parents money as well.
- *Paraprofessionals.* Certainly I don't think paraprofessionals, paid 7—or 10 or 12—dollars an hour are going to help us improve the academic achievement of poor children. I'm not at all suggesting they replace teachers. Again, I'm thinking a reconception of the concept of "school" that includes academics taught by excellent teachers and other activities led by other types of adults.
- *Not optional.* Though Ruy seems to agree with me that this should be a universal system in terms of demographic participation, I don't agree with his assumption that participation should be optional. Obviously, KIPP and other extended day programs would not work if they were optional. But this still goes back to my broad philosophical proposal. School isn't optional. This should be our new vision of school. Not school plus thus and such add-on. School. What society requires of kids. And it should include our current conception of school PLUS.... plus more academic time to accommodate our new standards and technology needs, plus more enrichment time to equalize opportunity across class, plus more time to integrate better with working families' schedule.
- *School buildings.* I agree with Joy's concept here. We should expand our use of these buildings because they're paid for and insured and thus cheaper. But we also should do it for the psychic benefit. There are tons of examples of where this is happening, and the educational part of the school reports increased parental support and involvement as a result. I truly believe this can be a cost-neutral, and potentially revenue enhancing (laundry) part of the equation.
- *Teacher professionalization.* Why would we assume that teachers should get 25 days of vacation? I don't get that many. I know most teachers currently work 8 hours a day, and I'm not suggesting they work much more than that (well, maybe some more). I'm also not suggesting they expand their student-contact hours. Rather, I am suggesting that their annual calendar reflect more closely that of other professionals, and that their workday include more formal time for prep, professional development, parent and community

meetings, etc. What if teachers were expected to be at school from 8 to 5 (or even 6?) but were in class maybe four of those hours, plus maybe another hour with some broad school responsibilities (lunch, guidance, advisory, extra curricular). If we could conceive teaching not as a task based job --delivering lessons alone in the room -- but as a continuous, thought based profession -- helping educate society's children, or even that community's children -- I think it would help.

That's my two cents ($2?) for now.

Part 4

Teixeira:

Richard and Jodi's latest postings raise a host of interesting issues and I won't even attempt to deal with them all. But here are few reactions.

First, on Richard's point about priorities and the potential unintended consequences of a universal approach. I reject the characterization of such an approach, in this context, as "irresponsible". Certainly, it's possible that funding this approach could crowd out funding for other priorities and it's certainly possible that there could be unintended consequences deleterious to poor students if the program is not properly structured and takes no account of these potential consequences. The California CSR initiative should have been structured in such a way that resources were available to address the problem of a shortage of quality teachers in poor areas. As Jodi points out, this is an ongoing problem that really needs to be dealt with by making it more attractive, especially in a financial sense, to teach in poor areas.

It is certainly the case that we can and should do considerable targeting of resources for this program and should consider fees and other means-tested approaches. But I think it needs to be in the context of a universal approach. As Jodi points out, we are thinking of this in the context of a major shift in how our society organizes schooling and it's unimaginable to me that this can be done without the full participation of the middle class (nor, speaking of political feasibility, does it seem likely that they'd put up with being left out).

I certainly think Richard is right to stress the interdependence of this initiative with the general problem of the supply of quality teachers and that we would have to expand that supply. But I think he is wrong in arguing--or at any rate, implying--that teachers' work day/year could not usefully be restructured around the ADAY format. I found Jodi's comments persuasive here and I think she is right to stress that, as we reorganize our concept of how schools work, we should also reorganize our concept of how teachers' jobs work. I think she's right that, in the end, such a reorganization would make it a great deal easier to get teachers the pay and professional status they deserve.

On the universal preschool example (incidentally, check out Idea Brief #5, "Universal Preschool," for more on this approach), I don't doubt Richard's description of the programs he mentions is accurate, but I was thinking more of the ambitious Georgia program, which is thoroughly universal and, of course, Al Gore's current proposal for universal preschool (for 4-year olds anyway--and note the special funding in his approach to help low-income families).

I think that Jodi is right that the *Incredibly Long Summer Break* is on the way out, as well as, of course, the *Incredibly Short School Day*. But I was intrigued by her insistence that none of this be optional. Do I take her right that school would not only be open long hours every day and most of the summer--but your kids would have to be there all the time? In other words, just as kids really, really have to be in school during 9-3 or some such in the school year--it would be more or less illegal for kids not to participate in the extended day/year activities in the new system? Hmmm....I'm not sure how that will fly with the middle class parents we were talking about (low income parents have fewer options and would presumably be less unhappy with this arrangement; also, as we have been discussing poor children really need to be in school in, for example, the summer). I'd like to hear more of your thoughts on how this mandatory thing would work and how you'd sell it to people.

Finally, on the paraprofessionals thing, I do think we need to think a bit higher than $7/hour but I think Jodi's right that the mix of academic and other activities we envision could and should include many adults who are not fully-qualified teaching professionals. The proportion of these

paraprofessionals and what they would get paid is a reasonable matter for debate, but I think they clearly have to be in this system somewhere.

All for now; I don't know about everyone else, but I am finding this an extremely interesting and stimulating discussion.

Wilgoren:

Just a quickie on my notion of mandatory extended day:

Remember, they wouldn't be in "school" in a pure sense. They'd be enrolled in school from 8 am to 6 pm but the afternoon hours would include a menu of enrichment programs that would be organized through the school system and use school facilities but include non academic programs run by non teachers. Parents would choose among these programs, in a menu. For children who wanted/needed, say, Hebrew School, which couldn't be provided through this, they would get a waiver. But the idea would be to have limited waivers. Like you wouldn't want to give a waiver for horseback riding. Rather, if someone wanted horseback riding, they'd have to try and get enough kids to want horseback riding to make it something the school or system would offer.

I know this sounds pie in the sky crazy, not to mention somewhat communist. See, but since I don't do this recommending policy or proposing things for a living, I don't have to be realistic!

Rothstein:

Alan Krueger's "Economic Scene" column in yesterday's New York Times, "Summertime for Pupils, When Forgetting Is Easy," reported on the "summer setback" research. But I don't think the voucher solution has been sufficiently thought-through -- he says "families could be given a refundable tax credit or cash grant if they sent their children to a competent academic enrichment program during the summer." Who will certify "competence"? Will parents who send their children to summer camp be denied the tax credit? Will summer camps start to do daily drill in multiplication tables so that they can qualify for the credit? Etc. Alas, I think there is no alternative to the creation of public programs to fill this gap.

With regard to our previous discussion about extending the teacher work year, 25 days off is not unusual for professional and managerial workers, although it is at the high end -- this might frequently be in the form of 20 vacation days (4 weeks) plus 5 "personal" days, etc.

The point, however, is that you can't staff quality ADAY programs simply by stretching the existing teaching force. A vast expansion of the existing teaching force would be required. If so, then it is irrelevant to this particular discussion (though it is certainly important in its own right) whether teachers have to clock in to a school building for 8 or 9 hours a day. If we are not going to increase their student contact hours, then whether they are in the school building for longer periods of time is not relevant to the staffing crises created by ADAY expansion. And remember, if ADAY is implemented in a school, the regular teachers' classrooms will presumably be occupied by other teachers during the additional hours. So if regular teachers are expected to be on-site for a full workday, where will they plan, meet, read, etc? American schools, unlike those in other nations, are not generally constructed to provide out-of-classroom office space for teachers. They should be, but this is another cost issue, and cannot be solved quickly.

Jodi has opened up a new area of discussion when she notes that the drill-oriented teaching styles of some of the newly fashionable low income high test score schools, like the one she visited or Kipp Academy, are not what we would consider high quality program styles. This is, of course, what the debate about test scores and test preparation is all about. This doesn't really relate to ADAY schools specifically, so this is probably not the place to go into it, but it relates to a point made previously: one way to reduce costs of operating ADAY schools is to give "teachers" scripts and not require the hiring of skilled professionals.

On the contrary, highly skilled professionals are needed, and Jodi is correct, in my view, that the single salary schedule for teachers is an impediment. High quality teachers will not be attracted to inner city schools unless they are paid more than teachers in suburban communities. NYC attempted last year to attract teachers to the "Chancellor's District" (a group of low-scoring, high-poverty schools) by offering a 15% salary increment to experienced teachers who volunteered. A 15% increment turned out to be insufficient. This indicates how expensive a program like this is likely to be.

With regard to whether implementation of universal programs in a period of resource shortage could be "irresponsible," California's CSR program was irresponsible because, while the consequences were not intended, they were fully foreseeable. The same can be said of the consequences of implementing a universal ADAY program, given the current teacher shortage faced by public schools particularly in inner-city communities.

Finally, reference was made to Gore's proposal for universal pre-school for 4 year olds. It's a terrific idea, but note: it immediately expands the demand for qualified teachers by about 10 percent, in a period of shortage. And note, at the same time, we are constricting the supply of teachers by a regime of teacher testing that, in many cases, is inappropriate.

Wilgoren:

I'm increasingly persuaded by Richard's comments that the teacher shortage is the predicate question to this discussion. It's difficult, with education (perhaps with everything) to isolate these issues, and I think he is right that that leads us back to the fundamental question of priorities. Because it's not just a question of which do we want more, but what should we focus on first that will enable us to do all these other things.

I wonder whether Al Gore or George Bush or maybe even Bill Gates or Jesse Jackson -- whoever our "leaders" are these days -- can do anything, both through speeches and programs and incentives, to ignite a much larger and more diverse and stronger pool of people to consider teaching.

As for the teacher shortage, which I understand is not what we're supposed to be talking about per se, for all the talk about it, among politicians, educators, everyone, I can't say I really see anything happening that promises to change the situation one bit. We clearly need a radical restructuring of the pay system; a radical reconception of the career trajectory (suggestions of a teaching hospital model, with apprenticeships and residencies and attendings are what seem most provocative to me); a total change in the workplace dynamic itself (the introduction of actual desks with computers, phones, voicemail, email, office space for meetings, etc, and the presumption on contribution to total school life as opposed to isolation in a classroom); a shift in the preparation process (on this a lot is actually happening, what with alternative certification, etc); and a major psychological rejiggering about teaching as a career choice.

I see a lot of talk and very little effective action on this front.

Over the last decade, since the founding of Teach for America, there has been a narrow, but successful, movement to get hot youngsters into the classroom. There are major flaws in the TFA approach, in terms of thinking of teaching as temporary community service rather than a career, but one thing Wendy Kopp has been wildly successful at is making teaching seem like a cool thing to do for the most sought after folks. This has resulted in some incredible young teachers. Not very many, but some. She and others are now focusing on doing a similar thing for mid-career types. I wonder whether Al Gore or George Bush or maybe even Bill Gates or Jesse Jackson -- whoever our "leaders" are these days -- can do anything, both through speeches and programs and incentives, to ignite a much larger and more diverse and stronger pool of people to consider teaching.

(And re my paltry benefits package here at the NYT: I thought, Richard, that you had suggested 10 paid holidays PLUS 25 vacation days, which sounds to me like seven weeks and is a whole lot more than what I get...)

Dryfoos:

It sounds to me like everyone needs a longer vacation. The beauty of being an independent consultant is you are always on vacation.

The discussion has been challenging to me...and stimulated some interesting debates...but we have strayed a little from the ADAY concept...Even without extending time, the quality of teachers is a major issue. The question here is, what is added by opening schools for more time...and what do we do with that time that will help kids?

What I believe has been lost in this conversation is the concept that other agencies have a role in keeping schools open…not just teachers and other school personnel. The idea is to create 21st century institutions that are more responsive to the needs of today's children and families than in the past. The building would be open all the time ADAY. The activities that take place before and after school, weekends, during vacations, and summers, do not have to be provided by school systems, nor by teachers. In fact, many of the activities (sports, arts, social skills, community service, mentoring) and many of the services (health, (especially dental), mental health, family guidance) can be better provided by people who are not in the school system. Youth workers and health workers are already trained and know how to work with kids. Much of this activity is already funded and available somewhere in the community. But the various systems are so fragmented and categorical, they have limited effect.

Of course whatever gets brought into a school from outside has to be integrated with what goes on in the classroom. ADAY schools would need a full time coordinator as a peer to the principal to make sure that all the activities fit together into a comprehensive whole.

The question of universal versus targeting is important. To create the infrastructure for ADAY schools would require some new source of funding. I believe it would have to go to the neediest communities first, as with Title 1. We can argue that Title 1 hasn't produced the most dramatic results, but it has managed to spread the funds out to needy schools (and can now be used for whole school projects rather than just taking the kids out of class for a little remediation). I am not aware of any protest from middle class families about Title 1 although Title 1 is a favorite for Republicans in Congress to kick around.

Schools have to be organized to respond to the needs of individuals. Kids and families have vastly different needs. Most systems already have summer school for failing students and some offer enrichment courses as well. ADAY schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods could do both, as well as serve as the site for summer recreation and fun.

We'd better figure out what to do with the public education system pretty fast or it will all be auctioned off to the lowest bidder or torn apart by the voucher-niks.

It seems premature to consider making ADAY mandatory. First, the models have to be designed and implemented to see if it really makes any difference in the outcomes. The "summer loss" stuff is certainly compelling, but if the remediation is build around preparing for tests, I doubt whether the effect will be long term.

If all ADAY does is over-burden the already over-burdened and under-qualified teachers and bore the already bored students, it will be another failure.

If, on the other hand, the ADAY concept is used to expand our vision of what can be brought into a school to enhance learning and youth development, it's worth a try. We'd better figure out what to do with the public education system pretty fast or it will all be auctioned off to the lowest bidder or torn apart by the voucher-niks.

Teixeira:

Well, I guess it's about time to wrap up our extremely stimulating and provocative discussion. Thanks to everyone for participating; I learned a lot and feel my views on this subject have been considerably enriched by our exchange.

Let me take the opportunity to summarize what I take to be the outstanding issues and questions here.

(1) Should we be thinking of ADAY schools as a fundamental shift in the way our society organizes the school system and its relationship to family and economic life? I am inclined to think so--and very much like Jodi's vision along these lines, as well as Joy's idea of "full-service schools"--but clearly the implications of this are enormous and we need more careful thinking about what that might mean in practice.

(2) Would an ADAY approach, even if desirable in theory, be just too darn expensive in practice? I am not inclined to think so, but Richard's objections along these lines make clear that much more thought--and some careful, empirically-grounded estimates--needs to be devoted to this question.

(3) Would an ADAY approach wind up unintentionally--but forseeably, as Richard argues--exacerbating the problems faced by schools serving poor children?

(4) What about the issue of the shortage of quality teachers and how this might impact the feasibility of an ADAY approach? Here Richard has completely convinced me--and others, if I read their emails right--that this issue and the ADAY approach are inextricably bound up with each other; our ability to construct an effective and fair ADAY system will depend on our ability to successfully remedy the shortage of quality teachers, especially in low-income areas.

(5) What role would paraprofessionals play in an ADAY system? We had some fascinating ideas here, and some compelling objections too); clearly this area needs more thinking through.

(6) Given that the program might be too expensive and given that it might unintentionally disadvantage poor children, would we be better off explicitly targeting the program to poor children, thereby considerably reducing the costs and avoiding the unintentional disadvantage problem (through quality teacher drain into affluent areas, etc.)? In other words, should we specifically reject a universal ADAY approach? I am not persuaded that this is desirable in a policy sense or feasible in a political sense, but this is clearly a suggestion that has to be taken seriously.

(7) Related to several of the points above, how important a priority is ADAY relative to other school reforms and spending programs currently under consideration? Is this an example of a nifty idea that just doesn't--or shouldn't--rate high enough on the priorities list to get the resources it needs?

(8) Should the extended day and extended year schooling be optional or mandatory? I guess I lean toward optional, though Jodi makes an interesting case for mandatory. And there's certainly a case for making sure, one way or another, that low-income children attend school and keep learning throughout the summer. Much food for thought here.

(9) Would/should ADAY lead to a fundamental restructuring of the teaching job and career? Jodi has some intriguing ideas here and Richard makes some compelling objections and argues convincingly that, no matter how you slice it, you can't take the same teachers and just stretch them out for the full year; you will need a considerable number of new teachers to make this fly--which brings us back to the teacher shortage, etc. Even more food for thought there.

Whew! I'm exhausted--but it's been a great ride. Thanks again to everyone for participating.

For more information on this transcript, or any other information relating to the Ideas2000 Online Dialogue Series please contact Tina Marie Doody at doody@tcf.org, or 212-452-7743.

Last modified: 9/8/2000 4:01 PM